

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addease COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1430 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.webjo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/536,736	05/27/2005	Louis Dubertret	P08652US00/BAS	4693
881 STITES & HA	7590 04/02/2008 RBISON PLLC		EXAM	INER
1199 NORTH FAIRFAX STREET			KARPINSKI, LUKE E	
SUITE 900 ALEXANDRI	A. VA 22314		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	.,		1616	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/02/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/536,736	DUBERTRET ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
LUKE E. KARPINSKI	1616		

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --Period for Reply

Status			

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MALLING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Extensions of them may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 113(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Failure for poly within the set or extended period for reply will by static, cause the application to become ARMONDED (36 US.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three morths after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned period for the CFR (40).	
Status	
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 January 2008. 2a)□ This action is FINAL. 2b)⊠ This action is non-final. 3)□ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims	
.4)	
Application Papers	
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheat(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	
12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a)⊠ All b) □ Some * c) □ None of: 1. □ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. □ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.	
Attachment(s)	

Attuciment(3)		
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)	
Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date	
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/95/08)	5). Notice of Informal Patent Application	
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	

Art Unit: 1611

DETAILED ACTION

Receipt of Amendments to the claims and Applicants remarks filed on 1/10/2008 is acknowledged.

Claims 1-17 and 19-25 are currently pending.

Claim 18 has been canceled by the Applicant.

Withdrawn Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

The rejection of claims 1-25 under 35 USC §103, as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 5,417,961 to Nearn et al. in view of US Patent No. 6,319,426 to Bawendi et al. is hereby withdrawn in light of Applicants arguments filed 1/10/2008.

Response to Arguments Concerning 102 Rejection

Applicant's arguments pertaining to the 102 rejection filed 1/10/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The Applicant argues that Nearn et al. do not disclose a fluorescent nanoparticle of a size which anticipates the Applicant's claims. The Applicant also argues that the composition of Nearn et al. is a sunscreen composition and not a make-up composition, and that the zinc oxide particles are used as a sunscreen and not as a pigment.

Applicant's arguments are not persuasive because zinc oxide is a known fluorescent nanoparticle as evidenced by Brooks (paragraph 9). Neam et al. disclose zinc oxide particles from 0.01 to 0.25 microns which converts to 10 to 250 nanometers

Art Unit: 1611

and reads on the Applicants claim of a size from 5-45 nanometers (nm). Regarding the recitation "make-up", this recitation is an intended use. The intended use of said composition is only given weight if said use results in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art. The intended use recited by the Applicant imparts no such difference and therefore is given no patentable weight. Regarding applicant's argument that zinc oxide is used as a pigment, the examiner points out that ZnO is still a fluorescent semiconductor nanoparticle.

Response to Arguments Concerning 103 Rejection

Applicant's arguments pertaining to the 103 rejection with respect to claims 1-25 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-6 and 22-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 5,417,961 to Nearn et al.

Nearn et al. disclose a cosmetic composition comprising: zinc oxide, a continuous hydrophobic phase and, a continuous hydrophilic phase within a cosmetic

Art Unit: 1611

vehicle, wherein the cosmetic vehicle is a w/o emulsion, wherein the zinc oxide is dispensed in the hydrophobic phase of the cosmetic vehicle (abstract), and wherein the composition is characterized in that it is a cream (col. 2, lines 25-27).

The instant application claims a make-up composition and Nearn et al. claim a sunscreen composition; these compositions are seen to read on each other because both compositions comprise the same components and are both cosmetic compositions, therefore there is seen to be no difference between the two compositions. The fluorescent semiconductor nanoparticle taught by Nearn et al is ZnO (zinc oxide), as disclosed in claim 15 of the instant application. The aqueous phase reads on a hydrophilic phase and the organic phase reads on a hydrophobic phase.

Regarding claims 22-24 the different characterizations of the composition is seen as intended uses without any specific components to structurally define the claims. The intended use of said composition is given weight only if said use results in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art. The intended use recited by the Applicant imparts no such difference and therefore is given no patentable weight.

Concerning claim 25 and the method of preparing a composition according to claim 1, Nearn et al. disclose the nanoparticles being introduced into an oil phase and as aqueous phase (col.2, lines 24-31).

Claims 1, 3, 7-17 and 19-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 6.319.426 to Bawendi et al.

Art Unit: 1611

Bawendi et al. disclose a composition comprising fluorescent semiconductor nanoparticles in a cosmetic vehicle (water) (col. 22, example 4).

Regarding claims 3 and 7, Bawendi et al. disclose the nanoparticles in both a hydrophilic phase and a hydrophobic phase (hexane and water) (col. 22, example 4). It is noted by the examiner that Hexane and water are a cosmetic vehicle.

Regarding claims 8-10, 14, and 15 and the limitation of the composition of the semiconductor, Bawendi et al. disclose PbS and ZnS as a core material, GaAs as a shell material (col. 11, lines 56-65 and col. 12, lines 33-39).

Regarding claims 13 and 16 and the limitations of a core/shell structure and a shell layer thickness, Bawendi et al. disclose a core/shell structure and a shell layer thickness (col. 12, lines 15-16 and 49-50).

Regarding claims 11 and 12 and the limitation of a mixture of semiconductors, Bawendi et al. disclose a mixture of CdSe and CdS (col. 12, lines 33-39).

Regarding claim 17, Bawendi et al. disclose fluorescent nanoparticles coated with a hydrophobic ligand and complexed into a micelle, the micelle being formed from a plurality of hydrophobic groups (hydrophobic core) and a plurality of hydropholic groups (hydrophobic group contains at least one chain (figure 1). Bawendi et al. also discloses that the hydrophobic chains comprise at least 8 carbon atoms (col. 14, lines 53-56) and the number of carbon atoms for all of the hydrophobic chains of a single group being greater than 24 (figure 1).

Regarding claims 19-21 and the limitations of specific hydrophilic groups,

Bawendi et al. disclose the hydrophilic molecule as a sugar block copolymer and as

Art Unit: 1611

polyethylene glycol (col. 6, lines 7-44). Bawendi et al. state that "sugar" includes polysaccharides (col. 9, line 64 to col. 10, line 16).

Regarding claims 22-24 the different characterizations of the composition is seen as intended uses without any specific components to structurally define the claims. The intended use of said composition is given weight only if said use results in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art. The intended use recited by the Applicant imparts no such difference and therefore is given no patentable weight.

Regarding claim 25 and the method of preparing a composition according to claim 1, Bawendi et al. disclose the nanoparticles introduced into water (col. 22, example 4).

Conclusion

Claims 1-17 and 19-25 are currently pending.

Claim 18 has been canceled by the Applicant.

Claims 1-17 and 19-25 are rejected.

No claims are allowed.

Inquiries

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LUKE E. KARPINSKI whose telephone number is (571)270-3501. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday Thursday 9-4 est.

Art Unit: 1611

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Johann R. Richter can be reached on 571-272-0646. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

LEK

/Sharmila Gollamudi Landau/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1611